

**Comment on a proposed emendation of the family-group name VACHONIANINAE Maury, 1973 (Arachnida, Scorpiones) to avoid homonymy: this is the correct original spelling and the case is resolved by application of the Code**  
(Case 3119; see BZN 57: 24–25, 167–168)

P.K. Tubbs

*Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

In their application Drs Fet and Braunwalder noted that the family-group names VACHONIIDAE Chamberlin, 1947 (pseudoscorpions) and VACHONIANINAE Maury, 1973 (scorpions) would be homonyms if the latter name were spelled VACHONIINAE, as would be normal practice because the grammatical stem of the name of the type genus *Vachonia* is Vachoni- and not Vachonian-. To avoid the homonymy they proposed that the scorpion name should be spelled VACHONIAINAE, taking the entire generic name as the stem.

However, Article 29.3.3 of the current Code permits a new family-group name to be formed from 'the entire generic name with one or more appropriate linking letters incorporated to form a more euphonious name'. Under this provision (which was not in previous editions of the Code) VACHONIANINAE is a correct original spelling; although not in accord with the then-current Code it was introduced by Maury (1973) to avoid homonymy with VACHONIIDAE Chamberlin.

The spelling VACHONIANINAE is not only correct but is that which has been used by subsequent authors, and Drs Fet and Braunwalder have agreed to withdraw their proposal and close the case.

**Comments on the proposed conservation of *Cryphops* Richter & Richter, 1926 (Trilobita)**  
(Case 3171; see BZN 58: 97–99)

An application by Dr D.J. Holloway and Prof K.S.W. Campbell to conserve the name *Cryphops* Richter & Richter, 1926 for a genus of late Devonian trilobites (family PHACOPIIDAE) was published in the *Bulletin* in June 2001. It was also placed on the website run by Dr S.M. Gon III (<http://www.aloha.net/~smgon/ICZN3171.htm>). Four supportive comments have also been placed on the website.

It is planned to send the application to the Commission for voting on 1 March 2002. Any person wishing to comment is asked to send their comment direct to Dr Gon by e-mail ([smgon@aloha.net](mailto:smgon@aloha.net)) as soon as possible, and by 15 February 2002 at the latest.

**Comment on the proposed designation of *Cuma rathkii* Krøyer, 1841 as the type species of *Diastylis* Say, 1818, and designation of a lectotype (Crustacea, Cumacea)**  
(Case 3078; see BZN 56: 174–176; 57: 45–46)

Sarah Gerken

*James Madison University, Biology Department, MSC 7801, Harrisonburg, Virginia 22807, U.S.A.*

In his description of *Cuma rathkii*, Krøyer (1841) observed that he had specimens from both South Greenland and the Kattegat but did not indicate a holotype. In my application (para. 5) I recorded that there was syntype material in the Zoological Museum of the University of Copenhagen, catalog no. CRU-7936. In endorsing my

proposals, Prof L.B. Holthuis noted (BZN 57: 45-46) that it would be advisable to select a lectotype for *C. rathkii*.

I have recently received on loan the *Diastylis rathkii* material from ZMUC. It is a single specimen, an ovigerous female from the Kattegat with the accession no. ZMUC-CRU-7936. The loan paperwork states the specimen to be the 'holotype' and it is apparently the only one now remaining of the original type series.

Băcescu (1992) referred to the two type localities for *D. rathkii* and wrote of the Copenhagen material as 'syntypes', but had not seen or examined the type material (L.B. Holthuis, in litt., September 2001). It is not possible to ascertain at what point during the 160 intervening years the rest of Krøyer's (1841) material was lost.

I confirm that the Copenhagen syntype is a specimen of *Diastylis rathkii* as currently understood. Since it is possible that the original material, from two widely separated localities, may have belonged to more than one taxon, to secure the identity of the nominal species *D. rathkii* I now designate specimen ZMUC-CRU-7936 as the lectotype.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout in Fairmaire, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera)**  
(Case 3147; see BZN 58: 105-107)

Philippe Bouchet

*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 55 Rue de Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France*

The application seeks to conserve the name *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout, 1859 by suppressing the name *H. neuter* Fairmaire & Laboulbène, 1854. The senior synonym has been used as valid once after 1899, which excludes the case from the reversal of precedence covered by Article 23.9 of the Code. The application (para. 8) gives four references to works published in the last 50 years that have used the name *discretus* and states that a further 16 references have been given to the Commission Secretariat. My examination of this list of additional references shows that only three have been published in the last 50 years. In my view the applicant has not demonstrated that a name so infrequently used as *Hydroporus discretus* Fairmaire & Brisout, 1859 needs conservation, and priority should apply.

**Comment on the proposed precedence of NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, 1845 over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)**  
(Case 3048; see BZN 56: 31-33; 57: 46-48)

David Agassiz

*Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

I very much support Dr Solis's application for the conservation of the family-group name NYMPHULINAE Duponchel, 1845 by giving it precedence over ACENTROPINAE Stephens, 1835.

I believe Speidel (1981, 1984) was correct in synonymising the subfamilies NYMPHULINAE and ACENTROPINAE, and ACENTROPINAE is the older name. However, my understanding, even before the greater emphasis given to usage in the latest (4th) edition of the Code, is that it is important to preserve a name that is in general use.